Marshall University
Marshall Digital Scholar

Management Faculty Research | Management, Marketing and MIS

3-1-2007

Cultural Implications of "Excellent Employees": Comparing American and Korean Workers

Chong W. Kim
Marshall University, kim@marshall.edu

Yung-Ho Cho

Andrew Sikula Sr.
Marshall University, sikula@marshall.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/mgmt_faculty

Part of the International Business Commons, Management Information Systems Commons, and the Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods Commons

Recommended Citation

Cultural Implications Of "Excellent Employees:" Comparing American And Korean Workers

Chong W. Kim
Yung-Ho Cho
Andrew Sikula, Sr.

Correspondence:

Chong W. Kim
Professor and Division Head
Division of Management & Marketing
Marshall University
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755
Voice: (304) 696-2682; Fax: (304) 696-6013
Email: kim@marshall.edu_____

Yung-Ho Cho
Dean
Graduate School of Business Administration
Ajou University
San 5 Woncheon-Dong, YeongTong-Gu
Suwon, Korea 443-749
Voice: 82-31-219-2315/2714; Fax: 82-31-219-2190
Email: choyho@ajou.ac.kr

Andrew Sikula, Sr.
Richard G. Miller Distinguished Professor of Human Resource Management
Graduate School of Management
Marshall University
100 Angus E. Peyton Drive
South Charleston, WV 25303
Voice: (304) 746-1956; Fax: (304) 746-2063
Email: sikula@marshall.edu

Abstract

As noted in Kim & Sikula (2003, 2005), there are three types of people in the workplace: "Necessities," "Commoners," and "Parasites." A Necessity (excellent employee) is irreplaceable and crucial to the functioning of an organization. A Commoner (average laborer) is a person of normal ability and talent who has no significant impact on organizational success. Lastly, Parasites (problem workers) are detrimental freeloaders who damage the functioning of an organization.

In the 2005 paper, we analyzed the survey responses of 25 students in an MBA Organizational Behavior class and 13 working managers, all in the United States. In this paper, we replicate our 2005 study in a different cultural setting: an MBA Organizational Behavior class in Suwon, Korea. We then compare the results.

The leading traits and behaviors that characterize the Necessity and Parasite categories in both data sets are very similar. Significant differences exist, however, between the data sets identifying the leading traits and behaviors that define a Commoner. We conclude by exploring potential explanations for the similarities and differences, primarily based on the respondents' cultural backgrounds.

Introduction

Human beings, by nature, are relational creatures. At any given time, all people, regardless of their individual differences (e.g., age, gender, ethnic background), assume multiple roles in society, such as that of spouse, parent, employee, friend, club member, and citizen of a city, town, or country.

Within each of these roles, there is always more than one person involved, from a very small number of members in an institution like marriage, to the very large number of members comprising the citizenship of a nation. No matter what type of role a person plays for a group at any given time, however, that person falls into one of three categories: a "Necessity (excellent employee)," a "commoner (average laborer)," and a "parasite (problem worker)."

The most desirable category is that of Necessity (excellent employee). Without colleagues (or partners) who are "Necessities," the group as a whole cannot conduct successful activities. The person of Necessity focuses his/her efforts on achieving the group's goals, and thus consistently makes valuable contributions to collective success. From the group's perspective, such a person is an enormous asset. Conversely, the loss felt within the group by the departure of such an individual is considerable.

Comments made in the workplace, about a person of Necessity, include "It would be hard to fill his shoes," or "She is an excellent person, it's a shame to lose her." The person of Necessity, however, may also be someone who works diligently without receiving much visibility or recognition within an organization (e.g., the faithful janitor who immaculately cleans the offices; the sports team member who sacrifices his/her individual statistics to do what is needed to help the team win). Either way, the person of Necessity occupies an important position. S/he provides the social "glue" that holds an organization together and enables it to function as a cohesive whole.

"Commoners (average)" or normal laborers do not make a significant difference whether present or not. They are regular performers who do not contribute much to the accomplishment of group goals, but neither do they harm group performance in any significant way. A Commoner is not a self-starter and tends to focus on "just getting by."

S/he does not provide significant input into group activities and shows little willingness to participate in improving group functioning. The Commoner does only what s/he is told or what is absolutely required, but nothing extra. And such a person never volunteers. Employees in this category are the "deadwood" of an organization, going through the motions and often just waiting for retirement. They are easily replaceable and not missed much when they leave.

The third and least productive worker is the "Parasite (problem worker)." This individual not only fails to contribute to group performance, but also harms the organization by acting as a leech and a drain on others. The Parasite is a loafer who desires a free ride, complains about everything, blames mistakes on others, and exudes pessimism in the workplace. S/he is not loyal to the organization and cannot be trusted to contribute productively to the group's goals. Such a worker is like the bad apple, corrupting much of what s/he touches. Many group members wish the Parasite would leave as soon as possible, as the organization would be much better off not having such a person around.

The traits and behaviors that characterize a person of Necessity in a particular role may be different from the traits and behaviors that characterize a person of Necessity in a different role. In other words, the characteristics that make for Necessity in group relations are, to some extent, role-specific. For example, to be a Necessity as a spouse, one must display patience, a loving and caring attitude, and the ability to compromise. To be a Necessity as an academic administrator, however, one should demonstrate self-confidence, intelligence, responsibility, dedication to work, and an ability to supervise.

For the purposes of this paper, we focus on the characteristics that are exhibited by the person of Necessity, the Commoner, and the Parasite in the workplace. But workplace settings can vary in many ways. The characteristics that place workers into these three categories, therefore, may depend on the workers' occupations, assigned tasks, and positions in the organizational hierarchy. The structure of the organization itself also determines, in part, what traits and behaviors characterize each category of worker. More broadly, the state of technology and cultural attitudes towards age, gender, and ethnic background also matter.

Nevertheless, we argue that identifying a general set of traits and behaviors that characterizes each of these three categories of workers across a wide range of workplace settings is useful for managers of organizations. Managers in any organization are interested in finding and attracting people of Necessity. Knowing the general traits and behaviors that characterize people of Necessity, Commoners, and Parasites should help managers recruit the right people. This knowledge can also help managers decide how to make good use of their current employees.

Although it is a strong possibility that people may have these three types of people as a universal concept in any workplace regardless of various types of organizations or in different cultural settings, the perception of a general set of traits and behaviors that characterized each of these three categories of workers could vary significantly according to divergent cultures.

Human beings are by nature socio-cultural creatures. Not only because their behavior is influenced by the norms and values of the society to which they belong, but also because they act to suit the nature of their traditional cultures. As a consequence, education and training at the earlier stages of childhood bring about differences in personalities and cultural values, which, in turn, make people perceive education and training differently according to the variations in personalities and cultural values (Newcomb, 1950). According to

Hofstede's (1980) cultural value differences, Americans have a high degree of individualism and a short term orientation a compared to Japanese and Koreans who score high in collectivism and long term perspective.

In our attempt to identify the general traits and behaviors of people of Necessity, Commoners, and Parasites in America, we collected two sets of survey data initially. These two sets of data were collected in the U.S. from surveys done in undergraduate and MBA Organizational Behavior classes, including input from working managers. Our analysis of these data sets can be found in Kim & Sikula (2003) and Kim & Sikula (2005).

The major purpose of this study is to compare and contrast the results obtained in Kim & Sikula (2005) – based on surveys of U.S. MBA students and working managers – with results obtained from an identical survey administered in an MBA Organizational Behavior class in Suwon, Korea. The analysis of data collected from two different countries may demonstrate perceptional differences among people due to their cultural differences, although people in both countries may have some common traits and behaviors of the three types of workers. Such perceptional differences could create confusion in the human resource practices of joint venture American/Korean companies.

Collection and Organization of the Data

The data for Kim & Sikula (2005) were collected in the U.S. from 38 individuals in July of 2003. Twenty-five respondents were MBA students with significant work experience; 13 were managerial employees of one student's company. After we explained the definition of Necessity, Commoner, and Parasite, we asked each student to voluntarily turn in a list of 10 traits and behaviors describing each type of worker. Students received bonus points as an incentive to participate. Neatly-typed entries of 30 traits and behaviors (10 for each category) earned seven points towards the student's course grade (out of a maximum of 100 available for the semester). If the content and effort were sloppy, or if a student listed fewer than 10 traits and behaviors for each type of person, the student earned fewer points. All students who completed the exercise, however, did earn at least some bonus points.

The trait responses of the 38 individuals were tabulated for frequency listed by the entire sample for each category (Necessity, Commoner, and Parasite). If a response was too generally stated, or too similar to the overall descriptor of each category, it was discarded. For example, responses such as "hard to replace" and "vital person" define a Necessity and hence are not traits or behaviors that characterize the person who is a Necessity. These were discarded.

A total of 1002 usable responses from the 38 individuals in the sample were included for frequency tabulation: 343 for Necessity, 314 for Commoner, and 345 for Parasite. These responses were then grouped together according to the words' synonyms and meanings through a two-step process. First, we made a simple table for each category by listing all the responses, from most frequent to least frequent. A Research Assistant then constructed a more specific frequency table by organizing all the responses in each category into a set of headings and subheadings. Two examples illustrate the process. In developing the frequency table for the Necessity category, he organized all the individual responses under subheadings such as Responsible, Punctual, Dedicated, Organized, or Mature. He then placed these subheadings under the broader heading of "Reliable." The final frequency table

for the Necessity category contains 10 headings such as "Reliable" and "Hard-working," with a varying number of subheadings under each.

In developing the frequency table for the Parasite category, he organized all the individual responses under subheadings such as Selfish, Arrogant, Antagonistic, Disrespectful, or Immature. He then placed these subheadings under the broader heading of "Troublemaker." The final frequency table for the Parasite category contains nine headings such as "Troublemaker" and "Incompetent," with a varying number of subheadings under each. The complete, final frequency table for all three types of workers can be found in Appendix I.

We then collected additional survey data, during September 2005, from 40 MBA students in an Organizational Behavior class in Suwon, Korea. This sample is very similar from the sample studied in Kim & Sikula (2005) in terms of the number of students within the samples, their work experiences, and ages. However, this sample differs from the sample studied in Kim & Sikula (2005) in two ways: the MBA students included are Korean, and the data was collected in the Korean language, not in English. The process of collecting and analyzing this data was identical to that followed in Kim & Sikula (2005) with an additional step of translation from Korean to English. One Korean student, who works as a graduate assistant at the university where two of authors work in the United States, translated the original Korean data into English, and the authors checked the translation to verify authenticity.

A total of 977 usable responses from the 40 individuals were included for frequency tabulation: 355 for Necessity, 290 for Commoner, and 332 for Parasite. After applying the two-step grouping process described above, the result was the complete, final frequency table for all three types of workers, according to the survey responses of the Korean students. This table can be found in Appendix II.

Analysis of the Data

In Table 1 below we identify the top five traits and behaviors for each type of worker, based on the frequency tables in Appendices I and II.

Table 1. Comparison Between US and Korea Data Sets: Explicit Traits/Behaviors

	The US-MBA Sample	The Korea-MBA Sample
Sample Size & Subjects	38 total: 25 MBA students who also work; plus13 managers	40 total: Part-time MBA students with most having full-time managerial experience
Necessity	1. Reliable (64 frequencies) 2. Hard-working (56) 3. Friendly (38) 4. Motivated (36) 5. Knowledgeable (29)	1. Friendly (78) 2. Knowledgeable (51) 3. Motivated (39) 4. Visionary (38) 5. Reliable (31)
Commoner	1. Friendly (48) 2. Unmotivated (37) 3. Conforming (35)	1. Unmotivated (66) 2. Troublemaker (55) 3. Conforming (53)

	4. Reliable (31) 5. Hard-working (29)	4. Ordinary (37) 5. Unreliable (33)
Parasite	1. Troublemaker (114) 2. Lazy (56) 3. Unreliable (55) 4. Incompetent (38) 5. Immoral (35)	1. Troublemaker (151) 2. Immoral (50) 3. Unreliable (35) 4. Unmotivated (33) 5. Incompetent (23)

As shown in Table 1, the key traits and behaviors that characterize a person of Necessity in the workplace are very similar across the data sets. Four of the five leading traits (Reliable, Friendly, Motivated, and Knowledgeable) are identical. The other leading traits identified – Hard working, and Visionary – are both positive and are consistent in their description of a person of Necessity. In other words, all six leading traits and behaviors identified across the two data sets do, in our view, characterize someone who would be considered a Necessity in the workplace.

We may notice the order of traits/behavior of Necessity in two different data sets: Friendly was number one in Korean data, and Reliability was the number one in the U.S. data. Implicit meaning of Friendly and Reliability may be different between a Korean and an American. Friendliness reflects the strong Korean value system of "Collectivism", which emphases harmony in an emotional way, and an understanding of respectful in a rational way to Americans. Reliability may stand for "loyalty" to a Korean, and self-control to Americans.

The number two ranking for the Necessity was Hard-working to Americans and Knowledgeable to Korean. It seems to be reversed since we expected Korean would value "Hard-working" and Americans would value "Knowledgeable". The implicit meaning of Hard-working to Americans was emphasized as specific goal-orientation, and Koreans emphasized broad knowledge and views in relation to the long term vision rather than a short term performance.

Therefore, there could be a significant difference between explicit meaning (denotation) and implicit meaning (connotation), although we have a common set of traits/behaviors for "Excellent employees" from two data sets, since Americans and Koreans may understand and interpret the meaning of "Excellent employees" in different ways. Table 2 summarizes the explicit and implicit meanings of "Excellent employee."

Table 2. Comparison Between US and Korea Data Sets: Implicit Traits/Behaviors

	The US-MBA Sample	The Korea-MBA Sample
Necessity (Excellent Employee)	1. Reliable (64 frequencies) *Independent and Accountable* 2. Hard-working (56) *Specific Performance Achievement* 3. Friendly (38) *Understanding & Respectful* 4. Motivated (36) *Lively* 5. Knowledgeable (29)	1. Friendly (78) *Group-oriented, Harmony-seeking* 2. Knowledgeable (51) *General Capability, Socially-recognized* 3. Motivated (39) *Devoted* 4. Visionary (38) *Long-term contributions*

| | Intelligent & Smart | 5. Reliable (31) |
| | | Loyal to organization |

The frequency tables for the Parasite category also yield very similar results across the two data sets. The characteristics Troublemaker, Immoral, Unreliable, and Incompetent appear among the top five in both data sets. The characteristics Lazy, and Unmotivated, while not in the top five in both data sets, are traits and behaviors that we believe accurately characterize a Parasite in the workplace. Although these troublemakers are undesirable workers in both countries, the permissiveness and acceptance of the troublemakers are higher in Korean society due to the cultural value of harmony in "Collectivism."

The key traits and behaviors of a Commoner, as identified in the two data sets, reflect much fewer similarities. For example, only two characteristics, Unmotivated and Conforming, appear in both. The subjects in the U.S. data set also identified a Commoner as Reliable, Friendly, and Hard-working, which also appear on the top five list characterizing a Necessity in the two data sets. The subjects in the Korea data set, on the other hand, used words such as Unreliable, Troublemaker, and Ordinary to describe a Common laborer. These traits and behaviors are negative, and three of them, Troublemaker, Unmotivated, and Unreliable appear in both data sets among the top five characterizing a Parasite. In sum, it appears that the U.S. MBA students and managers have a significantly more positive impression of a Commoner than do the Korean MBA students.

Conclusion: Possible Explanations and Directions for Future Research

The key traits and behaviors identified for the person of Necessity and the Parasite are almost identical across the two data sets. Identifying the characteristics of really good workers (people of Necessity) and really bad workers (Parasites) made no difference whether the data was collected in Korea or in the U.S. All eight of the traits and behaviors listed for each of these categories in Table 1, moreover, are consistent with the theoretical concepts of Necessity and Parasite. Although the explicit traits and behaviors for both Necessity and Parasite were very similar, the implicit traits and behaviors were quite different between two data sets when we analyzed the detail content of the responses. The authors interpreted these differences based on the cultural differences between Koreans and Americans in terms of "Collectivism vs. Individualistic," "Long term vs. Short term orientation," and "Harmony vs. Performance."

Many U. S. companies are doing joint ventures with foreign companies, and have established their own companies in many other countries due to rapidly growing business globalization. Without understanding of the real implicit meaning of an "Excellent employee" in a specific country would create ineffective ways to practice human resources management.

The identified traits and behaviors for the Commoner, while to some extent similar across the two data sets, reveal a striking difference of opinion (or perception) between the U.S. and the Korean respondents.

One possible explanation for the different responses across the two data sets regarding Common laborers may be cultural differences. The respondents in the U.S. data set viewed Commoners in a relatively positive light – as acceptable workers who have some things in sinc with people of Necessity. U.S. culture, therefore, may be more willing to consider reality in terms of a continuum, from the very good to the very bad with many "shades of

gray" in-between. This would mean, for example, that U.S. workers may be more accepting of the ordinary, or perhaps more willing to accept that in any work setting there will be people who merely fulfill their minimum job obligations, collect their paychecks, and go home without contributing in any special way to an organization's success. As long as these workers do not harm an organization, they are viewed in a positive light.

The responses of the U.S. cohort could also reflect their knowledge of the reality of most organizational environments. More specifically, these responses could be based on "workplace pragmatism" that has been acquired on the job. Commoners may not be special, but many actually do their jobs and contribute, albeit in small ways and without being leaders, to the success of an organization. In other words, perhaps the U.S. respondents simply perceive Common laborers as "ordinary" and Necessities as outstanding leaders and contributors, or the stellar members of an organization.

The Korean students, on the other hand, took a relatively negative view of Commoners. Korean culture, we have learned, tends to perceive reality as distinctly dichotomized: there is the good and there is the bad, without much in-between. It may be the case in Korea, as in many Asian cultures, that being simply average is not a desirable outcome, as society places considerable status and esteem on those who excel. One has to be the best or risk being labeled a failure. The responses of the Korean MBA students, therefore, reflect a more "black-and-white" view of the workplace, where everything is either very good or very bad. This view of the world could be one reason why the Korean students perceive a Common laborer in so negative a light.

In sum, if the U.S. respondents do in fact hold a more relativist view of how the world works, and the Korean respondents hold a more absolutist, dichotomized view of reality, this can explain the different perceptions of the Commoner across the two data sets.

The above possible explanation for the results we obtained, however, must be viewed in the light of the difficulties we faced in organizing and analyzing the Korean responses. We found it much more difficult to classify the Korean than the U.S. responses. The individual responses from the Korean students were much more dissimilar and more difficult to interpret. There were also many more unusable responses in the Korean data set than in the U.S. data set. These problems may reflect the students' lack of the theoretical concept, as well as the difficulty of exact translation of Korean into English. We recognize that this may well have led to the misunderstanding of a few Korean responses, at least to some extent.

Despite this particular difficulty, the analysis we have conducted here supports and corroborates the findings of Kim & Sikula (2003) and Kim & Sikula (2005), in terms of the key traits and behaviors that characterize people who fit the Necessity and Parasite categories. Our findings, therefore, should help separate these two types of people for organizational personnel decisions, including selection, promotion, and layoff processes. Further work needs to be done, however, in identifying a general set of traits and behaviors that characterize Commoners across a wide variety of workplace settings.

We plan, therefore, to survey additional employees, managers, and students in still different workplace and cultural settings on what traits and behaviors they believe characterize Necessities, Commoners, and Parasites. As we gather more data, we hope to delineate more precisely a general set of traits and behaviors that describes each of these three categories of people in the workplace. We will then design measurement instruments

for these traits and behaviors and make them available for human resources management practice.

References

Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kim, C. W. & Andrew Sikula, Sr. (2003), AThree Types of People in the Workplace: 3D Theory,@ <u>Proceedings of Pan-Pacific Conference XX</u>, Shanghai, China, May 28-30. This paper was also accepted for publication in <u>Ethics & Critical Thinking Journal</u>, 2006.

Kim, C. W. & Andrew Sikula, Sr. (2005), "The Characteristics of Necessity in a Work Place: A Replication Study," *The International Journal for Business & IT,* Vol.1, No.2, pp. 20–32.

Newcomb, T. M. (1950), *Social Psychology*, Dreden Press, p. 429.

APPENDIX I: THE U.S. DATA SET

NECESSITY

1. Reliable
(Dependable, Accountable, Loyal, Takes pride in what they do) — 23
Responsible (Independent, Self-monitoring) — 15
Punctual (Prompt, Fast-acting) — 7
Dedicated, Committed — 6
Organized (Structured) — 5
Emotionally stable — 4
Responsive — 2
Mature — 2
Total for Reliable — 64

2. Hard-working
(Ambitious, Motivated, Passionate, Tenacious, Persistent, Determined) — 15
Hard worker (Constructive, Diligent, Productive, Industrious) — 10
Goal-oriented (Focused) — 10
Conscientious (Careful, Detail-oriented) — 9
Exceeds expectations (Goes beyond the call of duty, Arrives early for work) — 6
Achieves/Accomplishes — 5
Multi-tasks — 1
Total for Hard-working — 56

3. Friendly
(Cooperative, Collaborative, Team Player, Inclusive, Courteous, Respectful, Reverent, Likable) — 18
Empathetic (Compassionate, Understands others' needs) — 5
Humble (Approachable, Safe, Relaxed) — 5
Extrovert, Charismatic — 4
Good sense of humor — 2
Forgiving, Patient — 2
Serves others (Charitable) — 2
Total for Friendly — 38

4. Motivated
(Energetic, Positive, Optimistic, Upbeat, Eager, Dynamic, Lively) — 21
Curious (Inquisitive, Asks Questions) — 5
Energetic (Enthusiastic, Spontaneous) — 4
Self-motivator, Self-starter — 4
Perfectionist — 1
Continual learner — 1
Total For Motivated — 36

5. Knowledgeable
(Intelligent, Smart, Sharp, Clever, Highly skilled, Expert, Capable) — 20
Problem solver — 4
Resourceful — 4
Fast learner — 1
Total for Knowledgeable — 29

6. Confident
(Self-assured, Secure, Decisive) — 13
Aggressive, Assertive — 7
Risk-taker (Courageous) — 5
Competitive — 3
Total for Confident — 28

7. Visionary
(Long term thinker, Creative, Generates ideas, Innovative) — 17
Proactive (Anticipates, Challenges) — 4
Originality — 4
Perceptive (Alert) — 3
Total for Visionary — 28

8. Honest
(Credible, Trustworthy, Loyal) — 12
Fair, Objective — 3
Integrity (Professional) — 3
Ethical — 1
Total for Honest — 19

9. Flexible
(Adaptable, Willing to change) — 13
Open-minded — 3
Receptive — 1
Total for Flexible — 17

10. Good Communicator
(Good net-worker, Good listening skills) — 10
Articulate — 2
Conflict manager (Mediator) — 2
Total for Good Communicator — 14

COMMONER

1. Friendly

(Agreeable, Sociable, Gets along with others, Easygoing, Amiable, Likeable, Amicable, Good attitude, Congenial, Pleasant, Kindhearted, Friendly)	27
Team Player (Works well with others, Compliant, Cooperative)	9
Humble (Modest)	4
Understanding (Empathy)	3
Civil (Good citizenship)	2
Appreciative (Gratefulness)	2
Patient	1
Total for Friendly	48

2. Unmotivated

(Satisfied, Comfortable, Content, Complacent, Safe, Does the minimum amount of work required)	20
Apathetic (Uninterested, Dispassionate, No desire to move ahead, Static, Lackadaisical, Lazy, Indifferent, Neutral)	13
Slow-paced (Doesn't like pressure, Relaxed)	4
Total for Unmotivated	37

3. Conforming

(Follows instruction, Follower instead of leader, Passive, Meek, Conformist)	22
Needs guidance (Needs direct supervision, Needs exact parameters)	5
Apprehensive (Anxious, Insecure)	3
Ambivalent (Lacks assertiveness)	3
Controlled	2
Total for Conforming	35

4. Reliable

(Dependable, On time, Punctual, Prompt)	16
Responsible (Consistent, Stable)	8
Emotionally stable (Even-tempered)	4
Organized	1
Takes pride in workmanship	1

7. Knowledgeable

(Intelligent, Prudent, Good ability)	11
Logical (Rational, Sensible)	4
Competent	2
Technology oriented	1
Total for Knowledgeable	18

8. Motivated

(Enthusiastic, Self-starter, Self-sufficient, Can leave unsupervised)	10
Eager (Upbeat)	5
Total For Motivated	15

9. Ordinary

(Average, Undistinguished, Mundane)	11
Limited potential (i.e., cannot multi-task)	2
Blue-collar	1
Total for Ordinary	14

10. Unreliable

(Imprecise, Inconsistent quality/lapses in work)	5
Careless (Impulsive, Impetuous, Indiscriminate)	4
Overlooks specifics (Little concern for detail)	2
High absenteeism (High turnover)	2
Total for Unreliable	13

11. Inflexible

(Not adaptable to change, Inflexible, Dogmatic, Conservative)	10
Not willing to take a chance	2
Total for Inflexible	12

Fair to Good attendance	1		
Total for Reliable	31		

5. Hard-working		**12. Introverted**	
(Dedicated, Good effort, Productive)	13	(Quiet, Calm, Peaceful)	10
Helpful (Useful, Practical, Pragmatic, Always doing something)	7	Minds own business	1
Conscientious (Accurate, Attentive)	6	Total for Introverted	11
Self-disciplined	2		
Achiever	1	**13. Troublemaker**	
Total for Hard-working	29	Complains	2
		Selfish (Lack of empathy, Blunt)	2
6. Honest		Disrespectful (Harsh)	2
(Trustworthy, Sincere, Authentic)	11	Distrustful (Skeptical)	2
Loyal	6	Thinks about self before company	1
Fair (Equitable)	2	Separatist	1
Integrity	1	Total for Troublemaker	10
Total for Honest	20		

PARASITE

1. Troublemaker	Not creative (Unoriginal)	4

Complains (Negative, Pessimistic, Cynical, Judgmental, Critical, Bad attitude)	28	Uneducated (Unskilled)	4
Selfish (Self-centered, Self-absorbed, Disloyal, Uncooperative, Not a team player, Does not work well with others, Does not care about others, Individualistic, Exclusive, Unlikable)	20	Slow learner	2
Arrogant (Proud, Conceited, Stubborn, Insolent, Dominant, Bossy, Defensive, Blames others, Passes the buck)	15	Unorganized	1
Antagonistic (Belligerent, Destructive, Abrasive, Virulent, Chaotic, Creates conflict, Confrontational)	13	Low quality product	1
Disrespectful (Rude, Insensitive, Rebellious, Obnoxious, Offensive, Verbally aggressive, Does not respect authority)	12	Total for Incompetent	38
Hostile (Spiteful, Angry, Irritable, Disagreeable, Unsociable)	10		
Immature (Impatient, Petty)	7	**5. Immoral**	
Gossips	5	(Dishonest, Untrustworthy, Mendacious, Liar)	12
Violent (Hazardous, Unsafe)	3	Cheater (Unethical, Doesn't follow rules)	6
Distrustful (Skeptic)	1	Manipulates (Back stabber, Deceptive, Deceitful, Scheming, Fraudulent)	8
Total for Troublemaker	114	Dishonorable (Lacks integrity)	5
		Thief (Freeloader, Cadgy)	3
2. Lazy		Foul-mouthed	1
(Idle, Apathetic, Uneager, Uninterested, Indifferent, Defeatist)	27	Total for Immoral	35
Underachiever (Puts forth minimum effort, Only works for paycheck, Half-hearted, No goals/direction)	19		
Procrastinates (Always provides an excuse to avoid work)	8	**6. Conforming**	
Lack of focus (Easily distracted)	2	(Dependent, Passive, Acquiescent)	8
Total for Lazy	56	Insecure (Neurotic, Anxious, Nervous, Tense, Low self-esteem)	8
		Indecisive (Hesitant, Has to be told what to do)	5
3. Unreliable		Total for Conforming	21
(Unpredictable, Inconsistent, Undependable, Imprecise, Negligent)	18		
Careless (Reckless, Irresponsible, Unaccountable)	15	**7. Inflexible**	
Tardy (Late to work)	9	(Not adaptable, Rigid, Unwilling to change)	8
High absenteeism	8	Narrow-minded (Close-minded)	3
Unstable (Moody, Emotionally unstable)	4	Total for Inflexible	11
Forgetful	1		
Total for Unreliable	55	**8. Introverted**	4
4. Incompetent		**9. Hard-working**	
(Ineffective, Non-contributor, Does not accomplish tasks)	10	Persistent (Repeatedly)	3
No communication skills (Low interpersonal skills, Difficulty in handling conflict/stress)	9	Ambitious	1
Senseless (Irrational, Disoriented, Pathetic, Dimwitted, Ignorant)	7	Total for Hard-working	4

APPENDIX II: THE KOREAN DATA SET

NECESSITY

1. Friendly

Helpful (Collaborator, Do whatever, Teamwork, Willing to help others)	18
Personable (Amiability, Friendly, Good personality, Harmonious, Not irritable, Polite, Respectful, Thoughtful)	17
Caring (Compassionate, Understanding)	13
Good relationships (Cherishes co-workers, Loves everybody, Wide relationships)	12
Humorous	8
Outgoing (Charismatic, Social)	4
Good at compliments (Generous)	3
Humble (Admits faults)	3
Total for Friendly	78

2. Knowledgeable

Knowledgeable (Competent, Intelligent, Skilled)	20
Analytical (Critical thinker, Logical, Rational, Strategic thinker)	13
Mentor for others (Advisor, Role model)	6
Experienced (Well-rounded)	5
Problem solver (Solutions)	2
Technological (Technical)	2
Common sense (Sound minded)	2
Fashionable	1
Total for Knowledgeable	51

3. Motivated

Motivated (Active, Energetic, Passionate, Self-administer, Self-sufficient, Spontaneous)	24
Positive (Optimist)	9
Constantly study/learn (Attitude to research/study)	2
Initiative (Propulsive force)	2
Perfectionist	2
Total for Motivated	39

4. Visionary

Creative (Creative business performer, Innovative)	22
Visionary (Foresees the future, Future-oriented, Has a dream, Macroscopic, Promoter)	12
Proactive (Challenging)	2
Good ideas (Idea bank)	2
Total for Visionary	38

5. Reliable

Responsible (Consistent, Observes work time)	20
Loyal (Faithful, Sense of duty)	5
Organization oriented (Knows priority)	3
Structured (Efficient)	3
Total for Reliable	31

6. Good Communicator

Leader (Leads harmoniously)	19
Crisis management (Mediator, Peace maker)	6
Shares information	2
Communicates through others	1
Total for Good Communicator	28

7. Hard-working

Hard worker (Diligent, Exceeds expectations, Goes beyond given work, Productive, Workaholic)	12
High achiever (Contributor, Does best, Successful)	6
Sets example	5
Focused	1
Multi-tasker	1
Secures customers	1
Total for Hard-Working	26

7. Honest

Honest (Outspoken, Sincere, Trustworthy)	19
Ethical (Fair, Objective)	6
Professional	1
Total for Honest	26

9. Confident

Confident (Decisive	8
Powerful (Strong-willed)	6
Risk-taker	2
Competitive	1
Total for Confident	17

10. Flexible

Flexible (Concedes, Confluent, Open-minded, Reasonable)	11
Self-sacrifice	4
Willing to spend money	1
Total for Flexible	16

Others listed:	
Passive	2
Attractive Person	1
Can be critical	1
Necessity	1
	5

COMMONER

1. Unmotivated

Unmotivated (Complacent, Content, Doesn't get involved, Doesn't self-administer, Happy not to be worst, Impassionate, Indifferent, Lack of enthusiasm, Lukewarm, Not ambitious, Not diligent, Not eager, Reluctant to work hard, Slacker, Unenergetic)	34
Lazy (Shifts work & responsibilities to others, Freeloader)	8
Unproductive (Achieves less, Low achievement, No profitability, Inactive, Unsuccessful)	8
No clear purpose (No target or plan, No vision, Lack of forward thinking, Thinks always of short view)	6
No self-development (Never studies, No self-studying)	5
Laid back (Carefree, Easy going, Unprogressive)	4
Procrastinates	1
Total for Unmotivated	66

2. Trouble Maker

Selfish (Self-centered person, Self-interested, Cares only about his/her benefit, Individualism, Reluctant to sacrifice)	19
Unhelpful (Reluctant to help others, Not collaborative, Uncooperative, Reluctant to share information, Never shares information)	12
Unprofessional (Doesn't respect others, Makes co-workers feel uneasy)	8
Complainer (Always unhappy, Critical)	4
Blames others (Excuses)	3
Talkative (Loud voice, Too strongly opinionated)	3
Trouble maker	2
Pessimistic (Not positive)	2
Defiant (Ignores order)	1
Prejudiced	1
Total for Trouble Maker	55

3. Conforming

Passive (Indecisive, Neutral, Sits on the fence)	25
Follows orders (Influenced easily, Will conditional obey, Low autonomy)	15
No opinion (Lacks opinion)	13
Total for Conforming	53

4. Ordinary

Does only given work	15
Ordinary (Normal, Typical, Habitual, Not unique, No personality)	8

5. Unreliable

Irresponsible (Careless, Unpredictable)	16
Unfaithful (Disloyal)	4
Wastes time (Spend lots of time to smoke, Coffee breaks, Naps after lunch, Disappears during working time)	5
Inefficient (Doesn't know priorities)	3
Late (Not on time)	3
Rough finish	2
Total for Unreliable	33

6. Incompetent

Incompetent (Lack of understanding, Not smart, Irrational, Unskilled)	10
Not practical (Superficial)	2
Not analytical	2
Difficult to communicate	1
Total for Incompetent	15

7. Inflexible

Inflexible (Unadaptable, Not concessive, Afraid of Innovation, No confluence, Reluctant to changing)	8
Never listens (Can't follow others)	2
Conservative	2
Repeat	1
Total for Inflexible	13

8. Introverted

Unsociable (Distant, Not outgoing, Lack of communication and conversation)	5
No good relationships	1
Total for Introverted	6

9. Friendly

Good relationships	2
Kind	1
Social	1
Total for Friendly	4

10. Hard-Working

Hard worker	2
Survivor	1
Total for Hard-Working	3

11. Good Communicator

Networker	1

No creative ideas (Not innovative)	6	Good at crisis management	1
Risk avoider (Not challenging, Reluctant to take chances)	3	Total for Good Communicator	2
Leaves on time	3	**12. Knowledgeable**	
No leadership skills (Can't set an example)	2	Relies on experiences	1
Total for Ordinary	37		

13. Honest

Sincere   1

14. Immoral

Starts a rumor   1

PARASITE

1. Troublemaker

Selfish (Greedy, Opportunistic, Individualistic, Doesn't care about others, Self-centered person, Not confluent with organizational culture, Cares only about individual achievement, Interested in power)	36
Trouble maker (Bothersome, Negative contribution, Others avoid, Splits organization)	23
Blames others (Excuses, Always tries to justify oneself)	21
Complains (Never satisfied, Jealous of others, Critical)	19
Negative (Pessimistic, Discourages, "Demotivate")	14
Arrogant (Egotistical, Prefers flattery)	10
Defiant (Doesn't follow orders, Instigates, Ignores regulations, Forces seniority, Uncontrollable)	8
Unhelpful (Uncooperative, Doesn't care about teamwork Never collaborates, Not involved in collaboration)	6
Unprofessional (Rude, Disrespectful, Impolite, Poor working relationships)	6
Antagonistic (Irritable, Too aggressive)	3
Talkative (Chatting)	2
Violent	2
Prejudiced	1
Total for Troublemaker	151

2. Immoral

Liar (Insincere, Dishonest, Not genuine)	16
Unethical (Corruption)	10
Manipulative (Political, Crafty, Cunning, Takes advantage of others, Takes credit for others' achievements)	8
Not sincere about time (Absent without leave, Does private stuff during work time)	7
Starts a rumor	5
Addictions (Gambles, Intoxicated)	2
Uses profanity	1
Not faithful to family	1

4. Unmotivated

Unmotivated (Indifferent, Doesn't care, Doesn't work hard, Cares only about salary, No affection for his/her job, Just interested in allowance)	11
Unproductive (No achievement, Low achievement, No benefit for organization)	5
Laid back (Easy going)	5
Lazy (No effort, Shifts work on others)	4
No self-development	3
Doesn't take care of self (Can't manage health)	2
Unfocused	2
No dream/plan	1
Total for Unmotivated	33

5. Incompetent

Incompetent (Unskilled, No expertise, Lack of understanding, Incapable, Repeated failure)	19
Frequently asks others for help	2
No proper fashion style	1
Can't separate private from business	1
Total for Incompetent	23

6. Conforming

Passive (No confidence, Indecisive, Follow majority, Susceptible to power/flattery)	6
Ingratiates to superiors	3
Cares what people say (Act & talk differently depending on context)	2
Total for Conforming	11

7. Inflexible

Narrow-minded (Doesn't listen to others, Doesn't accept change, Not receptive, Ignores opinions)	10
Afraid of change (Can't adjust to environment)	2

Total for Immoral	50	Total for Inflexible	12

3. Unreliable

Irresponsible (Rash, Illogical, Inconsistent)	14	
Unreliable (Late, Doesn't complete work, easily forgets)	8	
Unfaithful (Disloyal, Can't keep a promise, Can't keep a secret)	8	
Emotionally unstable (Depressed)	3	
Inefficient (Wastes time)	2	
Total for Unreliable	35	

Other listed:

Idealist	1

8. Introverted

Non-social (Tries to work only by him/herself)	5
No good relationships	4
Weird personality	1
Total for Introverted	10

9. Ordinary

Ordinary (Irrelevant)	2
No leadership skills	2
Leaves strictly at closing hour	1
Not innovative	1
Total for Ordinary	6